

EVALUATION OF HIGH BMI PREVALENCE IN PELVIC FLOOR PATHOLOGY

Pérez De Puig M., Pereda Núñez A., Palmero Aliste S., Moreno Coca G., Esteve Martínez M., Ojeda Pérez F.

Servei de Ginecologia i Obstetrícia.

Hospital General de Granollers, Barcelona, España

OBJECTIVE

The aim of this study is to compare the prevalence of overweight and/or obesity in patients affected from any kind of pelvic floor pathology, compared with the prevalences in general population.

PATIENTS AND METHODS

A group of 100 patients who attended in a consecutive way to the 1st specialized visit of Pelvic Floor between 2011 and 2012 were recruited, 97 agreed to participate.

Their BMI was tested, conforming 3 different groups: normal weight (18-25), overweight (25-30) and obesity (>30). Age and reason for consulting were also collected (pelvic organ prolapse or urinary incontinence).

	BMI 18-25	BMI 25-30	BMI >30
INE	48,29%	27,73%	13,66%
Study group	42,27%	36,08%	21,65%

Table 1. Distribution of patients according to their BMI in study group and general population (INE).

RESULTS

In our group of study, 42.27% of our patients presented BMI >25, in front of the 41.39% in general population. The proportion of patients with BMI>30 was 21.65%, while the proportion in general population was 13.66%.

Age: patients were divided in 3 groups: 18-44 (n=13), 45-64 (n=50) and >64 (n=34). There were no significant differences between these groups in terms of overweight and/or obesity.

Pelvic organ prolapse (POP): no significant differences were found for overweight (41.56%) and obesity (19.48%) compared with general population. The subgroup affected from 2n grade prolapse, with 35% of the patients with BMI >30, showed significant differences compared with general population ($\chi^2=3.527$ $p<0.05$), with a risk of presenting obesity greater than general population OR 2=598, IC (1.012-6.672).

Urinary incontinence: The proportion of overweight and obesity in patients suffering from urinary incontinence was 34.55% and 23.64%, without finding significant differences. For mixed UI, with 38.46% of obese patients, significant differences were found. The risk of being obese for a patient with mixed UI appeared to be higher, OR = 3.012, IC (1.007-9.404).

	BMI 18-25	BMI 25-30	BMI >30
Grade 1 prolapse	25%	50%	25%
Grade 2 prolapse	35%	20%	35%
Grade 3 prolapse	40,91%	47,73%	11,36%
Grade 4 prolapse	22,22%	55,56%	22,22%
TOTAL prolapse	38,96%	41,56%	19,48%

Table 2. BMI according to grade of prolapse (POP-Q scale) in study group.

	BMI 18-25	BMI 25-30	BMI >30
UI stress	48,57%	34,29%	17,14%
UI urge	28,57%	42,86%	28,57%
UI mixed	30,77%	30,77%	38,46%
TOTAL Urinary incontinence	41,82%	34,54%	23,64%

Table 3. BMI according to type of UI en study group.

CONCLUSIONS

Significant differences were found in high BMI prevalence in patients suffering from 2nd grade prolapse or mixed UI. The risk of being obese in these patients is 2.6 and 3.02 higher, respectively